DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 492 HE 001 238

AUTHOR Fenton, John H.; Gleason, Gail
TITLE Student Power at The University of Massachusetts. A Case Study.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts Univ., Amherst.
PUB DATE Apr 69
NOTE 72p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.70
DESCRIPTORS *Activism, Administrative Organization, Black Power, *Governance, *Higher Education, Power Structure, Student Attitudes, Student College Relationship, *Student Participation, *University Administration
IDENTIFIERS Amherst, *Massachusetts University

ABSTRACT

This essay, describing events surrounding a student demonstration at the University of Massachusetts, provides an understanding of the mechanics by which the confrontation came into being, and analyzes relevant opinions and attitudes of students. In 1968, the university's student majority supported radical student leaders in a tactical switch from Vietnam-related issues to others concerning student power. But when the radicals made subsequent demands for change "right now" in the entire administrative structure of the university, the student majority reacted negatively. A sample survey of the student body revealed widely held feelings of discontent with certain aspects of university life but not a desire to overthrow the university's administration. A survey conducted a year later showed that student opinion had shifted toward greater support of student power and black issues, and that there was a close connection between new left positions and black power advocacy. Student power and new left positions were related to age, sex, class, major, and membership in conventional student groups, but advocacy of black power was not. The conclusion of the study is that if there continues to be a wide gap between the radical leadership and a student-government oriented "left wing" of the student body, the prospect is for incremental changes in university policy but little or no challenge to the university's administrative structure. (WM)

ED034492

Student Power At The University Of Massachusetts

A Case Study

John H. Fenton and Gail Gleason

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BUREAU OF GOVERNMENT RESEARCH
University of Massachusetts
1969

HE 001 238

ED034492

Preface

Reports of student dissatisfaction now monopolize the front pages of newspapers and the end is not in sight. Faculty offices are rifled, deans are evicted, and students emerge from occupied buildings holding guns and other lethal weapons. Almost every major university and college campus in the United States has experienced a manifestation of student dissatisfaction with the status quo. The student power movement has also temporarily closed major institutions in England, France, Pakistan, and Japan. Students were once described as rebels without a cause, but this is no longer true. On the contrary, the number and kinds of issues are limitless, although they vary in specific form from campus to campus. In some places the demonstrations are symptomatic of a deep dissatisfaction with the involvement of the institution in the community; in others, the confrontations reflect two hundred years of *guilt* about race relations, and therefore deal mainly with the role of Black students, the content of Black studies programs, the employment of Black faculty, Black employees, and the recruitment of Black students.

The war in Vietnam is often seen as the overweening issue, with many of the domestic problems (including those of the "military-industrial complex," the crisis of the cities, and the lagging pace of change in race relations) exacerbated by the anxieties over the war and the diversion of funds that could be used for domestic purposes. But even the Vietnam conflict cannot account completely for some purely intra-campus problems which apparently are the stimuli to protests that are as vociferous as some of those against the war and the industries identified as "material supports" for the war effort. Included among these at the University of Massachusetts are such diverse issues as "open housing" on campus, which is a grandiose phrase used to describe visitation of both sexes in dormitory rooms. Students have also protested the lack of student involvement in policy formation, the construction of buildings in certain areas, the cutting down of trees, and the quality of food in the dining commons. Not all of these issues are new — but some are important.

We may have some clues about the issues that are alleged to trigger student protest movements, but we do not yet know very much about the participants or the leaders themselves. What kind of students are they? Where do they come from? How do they perform academically?

This study, by Professor John Fenton and Miss Gail Gleason, explores some of these questions as they emerged under the impact of the first major student-administration confrontation on the University of Massachusetts campus in Amherst.

The story told by the authors strongly suggests that demonstrations are now a major feature of academic life, and that university campuses may well be ideal places to begin revolutions, if only because of the traditional reluctance to interfere in any way with those who express dissatisfaction with the status quo, even if the forms of expression include disruption and, in some cases, serious infringement on the rights of other members of the academic community.

For many years, the Bureau of Government Research has issued publications on important and timely issues. The publication of this study is not an endorsement of the views that it contains, but a new manifestation of the Bureau's belief that the taxpayers of the Commonwealth, as well as other interested persons, are entitled to enlightenment on important contemporary issues. Among such issues, the present unrest on college and university campuses is unquestionably a critical one.

W. C. HAVARD
Acting Director

DAVID A. BOOTH
Research Coordinator

Bureau of Government Research

April, 1969

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 6

II. THE CONFRONTATION 7

III. SOME QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS 16

Analysis of the Sample Survey Results

1. Reasons for Success of the Switch from Vietnam to Student Powers 17
2. Profiles of Pro- and Anti-Student-Power Students 18
3. Positions on Issues 24
4. Reasons for Attending the University 26
5. Means to the End 26
6. Reasons for the Radicals' Failure to Capitalize on Student Discontent 27

IV. CONCLUSIONS 28

V. AFTERWORD 33

Appendices

A. Sample Survey Results 48

B. Cross-Tabulation of Sample Survey Results 58

Previous Publications in This Series 70

TABLES

IN MAIN ANALYSIS

Table 1	Pro-Student-Power Characteristics	20
Table 2	Anti-Student-Power Characteristics	21
Table 3	Family Membership Status by Proportions of Student Power Advocates	21
Table 4	Religious Preference and Church Attendance of Student Power Advocates	22
Table 5	Campus Groups by Proportions of Student Power Advocates	23

IN AFTERWORD

Table I	Five Variables Most Closely Related to Student Power	41
Table II	Seven Variables Most Closely Related to New Left	43
Table III	Four Variables Most Closely Related to Black Power	45

IN APPENDIX B

Table I	Campus Groups by Proportions of Student Power Advocates	58
Table II	Religious Groups and Church Attendance by Proportions of Student Power Advocates	59
Table III	Family Membership Status by Proportions of Student Power Advocates	60
Table IV	All Groupings of Students Containing 26 Percent or More of Student Power Advocates	61
Table V	Campus Groups in which Members Are as Likely to be Student Power Oriented as Nonmembers	62
Table VI	All Groupings of Students Containing 20 Percent or More Anti-Student-Power Advocates	63
Table VII	Background Data by Student Power and Anti-Student-Power Groups	64
Table VIII	Faith in People	66
Table IX	Reasons for Attending College	67
Table X	Sex and Marijuana	67
Table XI	Activism on Campus	68
Table XII	Vietnam and Civil Rights	69
Table XIII	Perceptions of United States	69

I. Introduction

In 1968 the political activity of American students received almost as much attention from the mass media as the presidential campaign. Yet, less than a decade before, most observers of the academic community lamented the political quiescence of America's youth. At that time, it was felt that American students were almost entirely absorbed in the "fun and games" of college life and that they had little interest or time left for "more important" matters, such as righting of social and economic wrongs or taking an active and responsible part in the academic life of the university community.[1]

Student power first caught the attention of the public in 1960. In April of that year, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee was established to coordinate student participation in civil rights sit-ins then being carried on throughout the South, and in June, a group of students met in New York and formed the Students for a Democratic Society.[2]

The civil rights movement served as a catalyst for student activism. The Freedom Rides and marches in the South gave many white northern students their first taste of protest, allowing them to translate their passive disapproval of social, economic, and political injustices into an active defiance of some established American institutions.

By 1964, most of the white students who had been "radicalized" by their experiences in the South were inactive, for their leaders had decided to withdraw from the Southern civil rights movement in order to organize radical protest movements in the North.

One consequence of this shift in emphasis was the creation of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement, the first major student protest designed to obtain concessions from a school administration through mass demonstrations. From September, 1964, through January, 1965, the students protested, first, political restrictions and, later, the "do not fold, bend, or mutilate" multiversity atmosphere of the University of California. In December, 1964, more than 800 students who participated in the mass demonstrations were arrested. The outcome of the demonstrations was that President Clark Kerr agreed to most of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement's demands.

The success of the Free Speech Movement lent it a luster that led to its emulation on hundreds of campuses, both in the United States and abroad, between 1964 and 1968. The student demands have covered every conceivable issue, from demands for better food in the

cafeterias to opposition to recruiting by the Dow Chemical Company, to outright demands for a dominant student voice in university administration. The tactics employed to secure these ends have ranged from peaceful picketing to the violent, physical occupation of university buildings.

Student protests and demonstrations reached flood tide in the spring of 1968. Academic life at Columbia University was brought to a halt and scores of other academic institutions were similarly threatened.

II. The Confrontation

In his September, 1967, convocation address, President John Lederle noted that the University of Massachusetts had so far been spared student turmoil and demonstrations. A few months later, in February, 1968, the University of Massachusetts in Amherst experienced a manifestation of student power. The purpose of this essay is to describe the events surrounding the incident in order to provide some understanding of the mechanics by which the confrontation came into being and also to analyze the relevant opinions and attitudes of students.

In digging for the causes of the February student eruption on the University of Massachusetts campus, a number of factors were identified, almost all related to the Vietnam War. The first event of a series of "happenings" which led to the student-administration confrontation was the meeting of a group which called itself ORC on the afternoon of Sunday, February 3. The name ORC was taken from a poem by Blake, and means in his words, "revolutionary fervor." The *eminence grise* of the group was Professor Daniel Bennett of the Philosophy Department. Most of the nine or ten student members were humanities majors.

Before this meeting, the group had confined its activities to conducting discussions of the Vietnam War and to distribution of two pamphlets on the campus. One of the pamphlets was headed *Commie Rat Fink*. It told of the "commie rat finks" who were opposed to the Selective Service system and urged all students to comply, literally,

with the regulation requiring all registrants to "inform their board of every change in their physical condition." It was urged, for example, that a letter be sent to the student's draft board "after every shave, haircut, sneeze, or cough." The obvious object of this suggestion was to bury the draft board in trivia. The second leaflet was a fictitious "List of Spring Semester Courses" which had been distributed during the January, 1968, registration; it was designed to show the extent of the University's "complicity" in the war effort.

The purpose of the February 3 meeting was to plan and organize a protest demonstration against the Dow Chemical Company which was planning to send a recruiter to the campus on February 15. Approximately ten students and faculty members — all of them ORC members — attended the meeting in the lounge of Tower 1, one of the student residence halls. The ORC members thought of it as an "underground" group, so there was no public announcement of the meeting. Invitations were extended by word of mouth.

Three points of view were suggested at the meeting concerning the form of the impending protest demonstration, ranging from peaceful to violent. Most ORC members were in favor of a so-called "theatrical demonstration" which would dramatize the immorality of the war for the student body. Others wanted to picket the administration building, while a third group proposed chaining the doors of the administration building to prevent their use, and that a sit-in be conducted near the doors.

After a lively discussion, ORC decided to limit the demonstration to picketing. A parade would also be held, to be followed by a bonfire rally near the Student Union. Steve Gamon, a sophomore sociology major, was given the responsibility for the parade, and Robert Wilfong, a senior philosophy major, was assigned the responsibility for the rally and bonfire. Dr. Bennett agreed to request administrative permission to conduct the demonstration. These people and those who worked with them called themselves the *ad hoc* Committee for the Dow Demonstration. Money for the costumes, food, and other incidentals was provided by Professor Bennett.

A second meeting of the *ad hoc* Committee for the Dow Demonstration was held at Kennedy Tower, another residence hall, on February 12, at which final plans for the demonstration were developed. The most important new individual to attend the February 12 meeting was Professor Ron Rubel, a member of the executive committee of the Valley Peace Center. The Valley Peace Center was an important focal point for respectable opposition to the Vietnam War in Amherst and was responsible for organizing such activities as the

Sunday Peace Vigil on the Amherst Town Common. At this meeting, it was decided to broaden participation in the rally by inviting representatives of "above ground" groups, and to add the selection of a "Miss Napalm," to the activities for the demonstration. Professor Rubel agreed to speak at the rally, and other speakers decided upon were Dr. Dean A. Allen, the University's principal Psychologist, and Professor Peter Salus of the German Department.

A final planning meeting was held on February 13 at the Valley Peace Center to prepare skits and costumes for the parade and to run off publicity material. A theater professor from nearby Smith College helped with the costume preparation.

The organizers and participants in the Dow Demonstration assembled in a common cause but with mixed motives. Some saw it for what it purported to be — an anti-war rally. Others probably joined in out of curiosity or "for the fun of it." A final group apparently saw it as an opportunity to promote social, political, economic, and/or cultural revolution. The last group exercised control of the demonstration.

The Mother of Voices, an "underground" newspaper circulated at the University of Massachusetts, described the Dow protest as follows:

> "Thursday, 15 February, will live forever in the history of the Cultural Revolution. That day the awakening masses of the student body of the University of Massachusetts took a great leap forward along the path of self-recognition and realization . . . . The revolution culminated a day of protest. Starting in the morning, 150 students led a parade in protest against Dow recruitment on campus. To the sound of jug band music, the marchers participated in a campus-wide guerilla theater tour. The tour, far from a magical mystery, brought before the apathetic masses of academe a display of burned children, grotesque manikins (sic) and pop-art battles. The responses were mixed.
>
> "The parade reached the Student Union where marchers held a beauty contest. Miss Napalm was picked from an outstanding collection of burned and bloody contestants. Next came an almost traditional campus bonfire.
>
> "Next came bloodied cow skulls, split with axes and cast into the flames. A barrel of cow entrails provided a bloody stain in the white snow, and those hostile in the crowd were stilled.
>
> "The word now spread that inside the Student Union an army recruiter had set up his wears (sic). A trickle became a stream and the resultant surge began combat. The recruiter lieutenant was verbally confronted and driven to *ad hominems*. His sign was seized and his table disturbed. A

> few liberals pleaded for the poor man's liberties but the radicals remained radical. Then, in a spark of mystical truth, a boddocks (sic) descended and the REVOLUTION began. From Dow and recruitment it spread to student rights, open housing, curriculum revision, and student power."

In fact, the shift from the Vietnam War to student power was no act of divine intervention, but the work of a single individual: Bart Kaplan, a graduate student in the English Department and editor of *Mother of Voices*. Kaplan was very different in ideology and personality from Professor Bennett, the *eminence grise* of ORC, the originator of the Dow demonstration. In an interview, Professor Bennett had stated that "one should be provocative, but to the end of turning those one provokes from off to on — not against." He saw the value of the Dow protest as "mainly to have students acting for the first time" and was opposed to the student power turn it took.

Kaplan had taken no part in the planning and preparation of the Dow protest because, as he put it, "I would have preferred more violent acts of protest." He was interested in neither the Vietnam War protest nor student power, but was dedicated to the destruction of the existing social, economic, and political structure of the United States. He joined the demonstrators when they entered the Student Union and took part in the confrontation with the army recruiter and the subsequent sit-in on the lobby floor.

Kaplan later claimed that his first concern was the hostility of the student onlookers in the Student Union toward the demonstrators. There were jeers at the demonstrators and cheers for the recruiter. In addition, some students threw water from the balcony onto the demonstrators. Therefore, Kaplan instructed his *Mother of Voices* colleagues to circulate around the lobby and attempt to gauge the temper of the crowd. The report from his scouts was that the anti-Dow protest was unpopular and that the only way to inspire student support was to change it to student issues and mainly open housing (freedom to entertain students of the opposite sex in dormitory rooms).

The Massachusetts Daily Collegian, the official University newspaper, described Kaplan's role at this point as follows:

> "The tenor of the crowd then changed. The concern of the speakers shifted to a protest of University policies and the war became a secondary issue.
>
> "Bart Kaplan, graduate student at UM and editor of the *Mother of Voices*, began speaking against University policies, specifically criticizing the lack of dialogue between the administration and the students.
>
> "Kaplan asked that all present abandon political differences and unite on the common ground of defiance of University policies. He asked that all stay for an open dialogue and requested that Lederle (the University President) appear to answer some questions. The crowd

> approved and some leaders indicated that if Lederle were to come to the Union they would move into the S.U. Ballroom for a discussion of issues."

At this point, Dr. Noffsinger, the Associate Dean of Students, appeared on the scene and attempted to negotiate a settlement of some sort with the demonstrators seated on the lobby floor. According to the *Collegian*, "Noffsinger asked for a guarantee that the group would move (to the ballroom) if Lederle came. He said he would try to call the President."

"Taking off his shoes in order not to injure anyone and as a sign of his sincerity, he made his way through the crowd, and the associate dean of students left the lobby to call Lederle."

In fact, Noffsinger reported to the Dean of Students, William Field, and Dean Field, in turn, consulted with the President. By this time, the sit-in had lasted from 3:00 p.m. until 6:00 p.m. and the administrators were anxious to bring it to a close by 7:00 p.m. because a movie was scheduled in the Union at 7:30 p.m. and it was feared that the students attempting to attend the movie would collide with those seated on the lobby floor.

It was Dean Field's opinion, after conferring with Dean Noffsinger, that President Lederle should yield to the student demand that he address them in the ballroom of the Student Union. Instead, Dr. Lederle proposed a meeting in his office with representatives of the students. Dean Noffsinger carried the President's counter-proposal back to Kaplan and the 100 to 200 demonstrators seated on the floor of the lobby (it was difficult to estimate the number of demonstrators because of the large crowd of spectators clustered about them).

Kaplan rejected Dr. Lederle's closed-meeting proposal and instead demanded an "open" meeting with the President to be held in the Cage, the school gymnasium. Dean Noffsinger took his leave in order to relay Kaplan's demands to the Dean of Students. After conferring with Dean Noffsinger, Dean Field, in effect, advised the President to accept the open-meeting proposal as the best means of terminating the sit-in without violence. Dr. Lederle reluctantly agreed to an open meeting on Monday evening, February 19.

The demonstrators greeted Dr. Lederle's "capitulation" with a cheer and immediately turned to plans for the Monday student-administration confrontation. Kaplan suggested that an *ad hoc* committee meet on Sunday evening to develop an agenda and agree on speakers for the meeting. The suggestion was accepted and the demonstrators left the Student Union.

The Sunday night meeting of the *ad hoc* committee was held in

the Council Chambers of the Student Union. An overflow crowd of 100 students attended. The meeting was "unchaired," but Kaplan was the central figure. Kaplan opened the meeting by stating: "We are not going to ask; we are not going to demand; we are going to proclaim a fiat." There was bitter disagreement between the moderate and radical student factions concerning the focus of the open meeting. The moderates wanted to concentrate on campus issues, whereas the radicals were more interested in attacking a "sick society." In the end, the *ad hoc* committee agreed that "Monday night's meeting will be opened by a student and students will follow in order discussing: the definition of a university, definition of student power, elimination of campus ties with 'the military-industrial complex,' open housing (the statement of fiat), freedom of choice in living off-campus beginning in sophomore year, elimination of grading, revision of core curriculum requirements, and a statement of defiance. The faculty members and administrative officials will then be allowed to speak." In addition, a meeting was scheduled for the afternoon of February 22, "to note administrative reaction to the ultimatum." The ultimatum decided upon was that the dormitories must be open to students of both sexes without regulation or the students would seize control of the dormitories after the Thursday meeting.

The speakers tentatively selected for the open meeting were Kaplan and James Collins, President of the Student Senate and a moderate. Collins initially volunteered to speak on open housing but was soon disenchanted with the group in charge of the meeting and, in his own words, "I spoke to Kaplan later on Sunday night and from what he said it seemed as if it was just going to be aimed at whipping up passion. I said I wouldn't take part unless it was going to be more structured and with some kind of dialogue going. He came to see me again on Monday and asked me to deliver the ultimatum and just left when I still refused."

Therefore, by Monday night the open meeting had been captured by the most radical elements in the student body. Two of the nine speakers were to be graduate students and they were to deliver the key speeches. Kaplan was to deliver the open house ultimatum and Brian Richards, a graduate student in English, was scheduled to deliver the closing oration. It was Richards' job to "raise the red flag" and send the students pouring out of the Cage and into "some sort of active confrontation" with the administration.

By 8:00 p.m., the Cage was three-fourths full with an audience numbering between 3,000 and 4,000 out of a student body of about 15,000.

Associate Dean Noffsinger opened the proceedings by saying that the meeting represented a "tremendous responsibility and a superb opportunity." Noffsinger introduced President Lederle, Provost Oswald Tippo, Dean of Students Field, Dean Edward Moore of the Graduate School, and the moderator, Professor Joseph Marcus, of the College of Engineering, who had a reputation for close and friendly relations with students.

The first student speaker was Helen Sullinger, a senior in nursing. Miss Sullinger spoke about the nature of the University and concluded, "We as students should begin to educate our educators . . . so that the University can take its place as a prophet, not a reflection of society." President Lederle replied, in part, "I would suggest that any social institution is bound to reflect society somewhat." The second speaker was Richard Marcus, a history junior. Marcus, one of the radical coterie around Kaplan, devoted his time to a definition of student power. He praised the radicals and belabored the administration. His central thesis was that the President and other administrators were there because "we, the students, told them to come meet with us." The third speaker was Bob Wilfong, a philosophy senior and an ORC member. Wilfong's thesis was that "students are niggers." John Siegel, a philosophy junior, followed with a demand for more student freedom with emphasis on sexual freedom. He observed that "they (the administration) still think they are dealing with a campus of 15,000 virgins — or at least 7,000 virgins."

Bart Kaplan was the fifth speaker and presented his "ultimatum" to the University. His thesis was that "what affects the individual is a private decision and should be his alone. You cannot legislate morality." He then called for action on the "open house" proposal by 2 p.m. Thursday (three days later) and called for disobedience of the restrictions on entertainment of guests of the opposite sex in dormitory rooms "if nothing is done by that time." Larry Mazel, a sophomore in English, then charged the "unethical administration" with improper acts, including the tapping of student telephones. Dean Field followed and denied the charge. The seventh student speaker was Mary Sayre, a senior in sociology, who attacked the University's course requirements, as "an intimidation to the student." Provost Tippo replied that the University was studying possible curriculum changes. The penultimate orator was Allan Hurwitz (not listed in the Student Directory) who attacked "grade intimidation."

The final speaker was Brian Richards, who had been assigned the task of "arousing the student rabble." The school newspaper's description of Richard's address is as follows:

"He began, 'The students have once again been told how the meeting will be run . . . the administration has once again had the last word.' He said that the students will now have the final word and 'The word is now!'

"Talking about the open house issue, Richards declared, 'What the students demand is open housing. They mean now!' He continued, 'If they do not get open housing now, they will take it now! . . . Once they've got it, the administration can't take it back.'

"The crowd became more and more vocal, and Richards, standing and gesturing with the microphone, kept yelling louder: 'We will not be told these things take time!' The audience roared its approval. 'Things must change now!' Richards shouted and the crowd roared its approval.

"Still gesturing wildly he said, 'The reports are in and they say nothing . . . The students say the time is now!' He went on: 'The students want an equal voice in how the University is run — and they will take it!'

"He then again delivered the ultimatum to the administration: "The students want open houses Thursday at two o'clock, and they will take them on Thursday at two o'clock! . . . If they don't, come to the Cage Thursday at two o'clock!'

"President Lederle chose to answer Richards, He began, 'Everyone would like to have everything they want now — but that is not the way the world works.' He then answered Richards' charges that there are 'C.I.A. stool-pigeons in the classrooms.' He said that if anyone can name them, 'we'll get them off campus.' No one named any.

"The President finished with the comment, 'I think there's been some playing to the galleries here tonight.' "

Generally, the reactions of the moderates to the meeting were in agreement with Dr. Lederle's final assessment. One prominent student moderate observed after the meeting, "The issues were supposed to be concentrated on core curriculum and open houses. But they (the radicals) threw in all sorts of things. It was a play to the galleries, based on emotion." President Collins of the Student Senate spoke for most moderates when he said, "I still intended to speak on Monday night if the atmosphere was reasonable. I sat beside a microphone just in case. But I didn't speak. I think a lot of the people involved wanted everything to happen in one night. This meeting was more or less the last time the original 100-200 got together (the members of the *ad hoc* committee to plan the mass meeting). After this, they split into three groups: (1) Sufi (Students United for Interaction) with a constitution that wants to change the system and achieve self-determination for students in all aspects of life; (2) N.L.F. (National Liberation Front),

which wants to declare Student Government null and void and would obstruct or destroy all sections of the University that help with the war machine; and (3) a group that just watches the other two."

The outcome of the open meeting was to polarize the campus and to factionalize the radicals. However, the radicals did agree to attend the Student Senate meeting on Tuesday night after the mass meeting to demand that it support the Open House Ultimatum. In the words of President Collins, "A group came to the Student Senate on Tuesday night and asked the Senate to unilaterally declare a general open house, but it was defeated 42-5. So they must have seen that the proposed Thursday meeting and march into the houses wouldn't work. That was the end of it."

However, the National Liberation Front, allegedly headed by Kaplan, issued one last, defiant, unsigned broadside. The pamphlet was entitled "The Ultimatum" and its text is as follows:

> "The ultimatum delivered Monday night to be effected Thursday is inconsequential to the University of Massachusetts N.L.F. and we declare ourselves in absolute estrangement from such petty concerns. We hereby declare open warfare on all those aspects of the University life which are contributing to the destruction of our lives, the life of the nation, and the survival of the world.
>
> "The students have not betrayed us, they have betrayed themselves. Our first concern was, is, and will continue to be the inhumanity of the war in Vietnam and the complicity of the University of Massachusetts in that treasonous carnage.
>
> "The student senate, the *Collegian*, and the other so-called legitimate channels have again as always proved themselves impotent and fraudulent. It is impossible to deal with them or to allow them legitimacy. We declare them defunct.
>
> "It is only through concern with paramount issues that students at the University can ever hope to achieve anything called student power. We declare ourselves custodians of those issues.
>
> "Lederle suggested Monday night that ROTC is a basic function and privilege in the character of the University of Massachusetts. His position is indefensible. We abhore (*sic*) such fatuous self-justification. It is precisely this brand of sophistry that has led us to a 'kill for peace' ideology.
>
> "It is also implicit that research grants facilitating germ warfare as well as numerous other contracts which, however innocuous on the surface, may lead ultimately to genocide is part of the genuine function of a land-grant university. At this point their position may no longer be called complicity,

but outright participation in political euthanasia.

"With faculty and administrative accomplices in and out of uniform, it is only logical that they should promote the exploitation of the student body through a systematic program of military and industrial recruitment.

"We shall use every conceivable means to disrupt, circumvent, and destroy the function of the University of Massachusetts in the war machine. We declare ourselves an integral part of the world-wide struggle against conscious militarism and mindless yea-saying that involves us all in inhuman tyranny and murder. We dedicate our lives and more to that struggle."

The N.L.F. was the far left segment of the campus radicals and included three of the student speakers at the mass meeting; namely, Kaplan, Marcus, and Richards. Their broad attitude was contempt for the students and hatred of the society. One stated, "If the majority of the students won't work with us, the hell with them — they're a bunch of 'jocks' anyway." According to N.L.F. members, the specific short-run N.L.F. activities were to "look for CIA agents on campus, explore secret University of Massachusetts government contracts, and sympathetic responses to the actions of Dr. Spock." One member of the N.L.F. remarked: "I am a member of the N.L.F. to prepare for the revolution."

III. Some Questions and Answers

The foregoing account of the emergence of a student power movement on the University of Massachusetts campus suggests a number of questions. One of the first, perhaps, is the reason for the initial success of the tactical switch from Vietnam to student power at the time of the sit-in. Another is the identity of these angry young men and women. Who were they? What did they want? How did they intend to get it? Finally, why did they fail to attract broadly based support on the University of Massachusetts campus?

Analysis of the Sample Survey Results

A description of findings from the sample survey of students follows, with an analysis of the data. The objective will be to search out some tentative answers to the questions posed above.

1. REASONS FOR SUCCESS OF THE SWITCH FROM VIETNAM TO STUDENT POWER

The results of the sample survey of the University of Massachusetts student body revealed rather widely held feelings of discontent with certain aspects of University life. In response to a question concerning the quality of teaching at the University, 68 percent said that poor teaching had been an important or very important problem for them. A second question dealing with "rigidity of course requirements" revealed that the same proportion (68 percent) of students polled were unhappy with the school's course requirements. Quite naturally, student support for student power was most pronounced in these same areas of concern. In the survey, 64 percent of the sample wanted an equal voice or better with faculty and administration in determining course offerings. Eighty-three percent felt that students should evaluate professors and courses, compile the results, and make the findings available to the college community. However, only a minority were interested in a major voice in business decisions (17 percent), long-range planning (43 percent), appointment of faculty (12 percent), and faculty promotion, tenure, and dismissal (27 percent).

The radicals, then, transferred from a relatively unpopular position to one on which there was some student consensus when they changed from Vietnam to student issues. A similar tactic was used successfully on the University of California campus in 1964.

". . . Nothing but the cause of free speech," remarked an observer of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement, ". . . could have drawn together the amorphous and shifting mass, together with some of the disaffected fringe, behind the experienced leadership. No other cause could have combined so many resentments, dispelled so many misgivings and brought to the surface so much frustrated idealism."[3] Similarly, at the University of Massachusetts in 1968 the survey data suggest that nothing but an attack on courses and requirements could have shifted student support so quickly to the radicals' side. On the other hand, at the time of the sit-in, the students were almost evenly divided on the issue of stopping the bombing of North Vietnam in order to encourage a negotiated settlement of the war.

When the students sitting in at the Union moved from Vietnam to an attack on student frustrations with courses, food, and registration, the mood of the observers switched from antagonism to agreement; those on the outer rims joined in to add their own personal grievances against the University. On the other hand, "what happened later in

the Cage," commented James Collins, "was that the leadership switched from the things the kids were upset about to other issues and everyone lost interest."

2. PROFILES OF PRO- AND ANTI-STUDENT POWER

As has been shown, many of the student power leaders were graduate students and faculty members in the Humanities (the English, History, and Philosophy Departments). The sample survey makes it possible to expand these observations by identifying and describing the "rank and file" advocates of student power.

Student power is a somewhat ambiguous term and has been used to describe everything from shutting down a university to supporting a basketball team. However, to the student power leaders on most campuses, it means an attempt, on the part of the students, to wrest the decision-making control in their schools away from the administrators, boards of trustees, and other "nonacademics" whom they perceive to be in the driver's seat. "Our idea is that the university is composed of faculty, students, books, and ideas," said a Free Speech Movement leader. "In a literal sense, the administration is merely there to make sure the sidewalks are kept clean."[4] It is this definition of student power that was used in attempting to classify the students at the University of Massachusetts according to their pro- or anti-student power sympathies.

Forty-eight student respondents to the survey were classified as strongly pro-student power, on the basis of their answers to seven questions. Five of the questions asked the student respondent to indicate whether he was in favor of (1) "student decision," (2) "joint decision with faculty and administration," (3) "advisory role," or (4) "no student involvement" in decisions concerning course offerings; promotions, tenure, and dismissal of professors; employment of faculty; long-range planning; and business decisions. In addition, there were two questions wherein students were asked whether they (1) "strongly favored," (2) "favored," (3) "opposed," or (4) "strongly opposed" published student evaluations of professors and courses; and freedom of the students in each residence hall to set their own visiting rules.

A score of seven on the responses to the seven questions meant that the respondent was in favor of virtual student rule of the University and a score of 28 meant that the student preferred "no student involvement," in the administration of the University. Most students, of course, ranged between these two extremes. There were

48 with scores of 10-16 (21 percent of the sample). These were separately examined in an effort to discover how these very pro-student-power people differed from the other students in the sample. For purposes of comparison, the 37 students (16 percent of the sample) with scores of from 22-26 were also separately analyzed in an attempt to show the basis for the strong anti-student-power position.

These separate analyses indicated that the prototype of the student-power advocates was a female student in her sophomore year who did not practice or profess a religious faith, got along poorly with her parents and identified politically with the Democratic party (see Table 1). The "ideal" anti-student-power respondent was shown as an older male student who lived at home, identified with the Republican party, had a father who owned a small business, was a fourth-generation or more American, and was an active fraternity member (see Table 2).

The results of the survey suggest, then, that the major variables related to positions on student power issues are sex, age, family relationships, religious identification, and membership in campus organizations. The relationship between an unravelling of family relationships and student power advocacy appear to be the most important finding (see Table 3). It tends to confirm the intuitive judgments of those who refer to the radicals as "the Dr. Spock generation." Kenneth Kenniston, in his study of young radicals, suggests that most young people who will later become committed to the Movement are likely to enter a period of rebellion against their parents.[5]

Only nine percent of the students who lived at home were in the strongly pro-student-power category; 19 percent of those going home frequently or on school holidays were in this group and 39 percent of those students who said they "go home as seldom as possible." On the other hand, students who lived at home tended to be anti-student power. Much along the same line, 17 percent of those who said their parents understood them "very well" were pro-student power, compared with 33 percent who said "not so well" and 57 percent who said "not at all."

TABLE 1
THE PRO-STUDENT-POWER CHARACTERISTICS[a]
Attitudes Toward Student Power by Characteristics Containing 26 Percent or More Student Power Advocates in Percent

Characteristics	Strongly Pro-Student Power	N
Parents understand "not at all"	57%	7
Go home "as seldom as possible"	39	28
Parents "too permissive"	36	14
Never attend church	34	35
Parents understand "not so well"	33	27
Democratic party preference	32	25
No "religious faith membership"	31	35
Father's occupation "blue collar"	31	45
Unitarian faith	30	10
Female	29	100
Do not "believe in God"	28	32
Below a "C" average	28	36
Mother's political preference "Independent"	28	36
Parents "too strict"	27	22
Father's political preference Democratic	26	60
Sophomore	26	70
Total Sample	21	232

[a] In this and the following tables, the possible margin of error for some of the percentages is quite large. For example, the chances are 95 out of 100 that the opinions of the entire student body are within plus and minus 36 percentage points of the 57 percent figure. In other cases, the margin of error is much smaller depending on the size of the number in the last column. It should be recognized, though, that the figures become significant only in light of the patterns that emerge in the table, such as the frequency with which items dealing with family and religion appear in the tables.

TABLE 2
THE ANTI-STUDENT-POWER CHARACTERISTICS
Attitudes Toward Student Power by Characteristics Containing 20 Percent or More Anti-Student-Power Advocates in Percent

Characteristics	Strongly Anti-Student Power	N
Graduate students	43%	23
Live at home	35	23
Republican party preference	33	30
Father's occupation — small business	24	38
Fourth-generation or more American	24	63
Age 21 or over	24	100
Father's occupation "other white collar"	23	34
Male	21	132
Active Fraternity or Sorority member	21	57
Parents "too permissive"	21	14
Engineering major	20	15
Mother's political preference Republican	20	55
Total Sample	16	232

TABLE 3
Family Membership Status by Proportions of Student Power Advocates in Percent

Questions/Responses	Strongly Pro-S.P.	All Others	N
1. How often do you leave campus and go home to see your family?			
Live at home	9%	91%	23
Go home frequently	19	81	66
Go home on school holidays	19	81	115
Go home as seldom as possible	39	61	28
2. How well do you think your parents understand you?[a]			
Very well	17	83	66
Pretty well	18	82	129
Not so well	33	67	27
Not at all	57	43	7
3. Would you say that, in supervising you, your parents were:[b]			
About right	19	81	195
Too strict	27	73	22
Too permissive	36	64	14

[a]Three "don't know" responses.

[b]One "don't know" response.

The findings seem to echo the results of a study made by Seymour Martin Lipset at Berkeley almost twenty years ago. He found that students living at home were less likely to support the faculty's opposition to the state loyalty oath than those who lived on campus.[6]

Conventional church membership and church attendance were also negatively related to the pro-student-power position (see Table 4). Fourteen percent of the Protestant students, 19 percent of the Catholics, 22 percent of the Jews, 30 percent of the Unitarians, and 31 percent of those professing no religious faith were strongly pro-student power. In terms of church attendance, only 17 percent of those who attended church were among the militants.

The same general tendency of nonmembers to be more pro-student power than members was found in campus groups, such as fraternities and sororities, athletic groups, service clubs, hobby clubs, and professional or academic groups (see Table 5). The only important campus groups wherein the members were as likely as non-members to be pro-student power were political and student government groups.

TABLE 4
Religious Preference and Church Attendance
of Student Power Advocates

	Strongly Pro-S.P.	All Others	N[a]
1. Religious Preference			
Protestant	14%	86%	62
Catholic	19	81	94
Jewish	22	78	31
Unitarian and other	30	70	10
None or no religious faith	31	69	35
2. Church Attendance			
Attend frequently	17	83	91
Attend seldom	20	80	101
Never attend	34	66	35

[a]There were five students who refused to answer the church attendance question, one of whom was a student power advocate.

TABLE 5
Campus Groups by Proportions of Student Power Advocates in Percent

Campus Groups	Strongly Pro-S.P.	All Others	N
1. Fraternity or Sorority			
Active member	11%	89%	57
Inactive member	19	81	16
Not a member	25	75	159
2. Athletic Groups			
Active member	12	88	41
Inactive member	16	84	25
Not a member	23	77	166
3. Service Clubs			
Active member	9	91	22
Inactive member	14	86	14
Not a member	23	77	196
4. Hobby Clubs [a]			
Active member	15	85	20
Inactive member	17	83	18
Not a member	22	78	194
5. Professional or Academic Groups			
Active member	9	91	47
Inactive member	23	77	26
Not a member	24	76	159

[a] "Don't know" replies are classified as "not a member."

Student power advocates at the University of Massachusetts, then, tend to fall into about the same religious categories as earlier studies of student liberalism have indicated. Jews, Unitarians, and those belonging to no organized religion were most student-power oriented, while Protestants and Catholics tended to be more conservative in this respect. It seems also logical to expect that students holding leftist political orientations, particularly those who feel that these ideals should be given a high degree of priority in their lives, would not be interested in joining conventional social, hobby, or service clubs.

It is interesting to speculate about the importance of the sex variable in relation to club memberships as opposed to involvement in the student power movement. Except for sororities, which tend to be very conventional in their outlooks, there are few organizations in which girls can take a leading part in college. Most student activities tend to be dominated by male leaders. Therefore, since girls do not find outlets for their energies in varsity sports or conventional club groupings, they may be inclined to turn to student power as one of the few areas of student life in which they can take a leading and exciting part.

3. POSITION ON ISSUES

The failure of family, church, and other institutions to indoctrinate pro-student-power people with "traditional" values is most clearly evident in their attitudes toward sex, drugs, Vietnam, and civil rights, and their perceptions of the nature of man and their position in society. While their responses to some of these questions might have been those of a liberal adult (i.e., Vietnam and civil rights), others show a more radical departure from the conventional wisdom of society.

The sex and marijuana responses of the students conform closely to stereotypes of the student power movement. The pro-student-power segment of the sample was in favor of legalizing the use, possession, and sale of marijuana (52 percent in favor) and the anti-student-power segment was opposed to legalizing marijuana (70 percent opposed). The pro-student-power respondents were also in favor of the University Health Services making contraceptives available to students (75 percent in favor), whereas anti-student-power people were again opposed (59 percent).

As might be expected, one of the widest differences between pro- and anti-student-power groups was on the issue of the Vietnam War. Seventy-three percent of the pro-student-power enthusiasts were in favor of halting the bombing of North Vietnam, while 68 percent of the

anti-student-power group were opposed to a bombing pause, and the student body as a whole divided evenly on the issue. The division between the two groups was almost as great on the "busing of Negroes from racially imbalanced to predominantly white schools" controversy, with 54 percent of the pro-student-power group supporting busing and 78 percent of those opposed to student power opposing busing.

The pro-student-power group also tended to be more critical of American society than the anti-student-power group. When offered favorable versus unfavorable perceptions of American society (racially bigoted or tolerant, warlike and aggressive or peace-loving, immoral or moral, hypocritical or sincere, class-conscious or equalitarian), the student power people were more likely to select the critical observation than either the student body as a whole or the anti-student-power group. The two alternatives on which the gap was widest between the pro- and anti-student-power groups were "warlike and aggressive" (50 percent versus 32 percent agreement) and "hypocritical" (77 percent versus 51 percent agreement).

The findings from the above are that the student power advocates tend to reject many of the institutions and values which American society at large defends and to be more critical of the nation's domestic and international policies than other students. In this respect they closely conform to the general image of the student power movement.

Student power advocates at the University of Massachusetts tended to express a feeling of alienation from and frustration with society, similar to that which Mario Savio expressed during the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley in 1964. He said:

> "...'the best among the people who enter [the University] must for four years wander aimlessly much of the time questioning why they are on campus at all, doubting whether there is any point in what they are doing, and looking toward a very bleak existence afterward in a game in which all the rules have been made up — rules which one cannot really amend. It is a bleak scene but it is all a lot of us have to look forward to."[7]

Student power advocates scored lower on "Faith in People" questions than their anti-student-power peers. For example, 44 percent agreed that "these days a person doesn't really know who he can count on," as opposed to 22 percent agreement by the anti-student-power people.

Kenniston notes in his study that "whatever its many other

meanings, the focus on the short-range and the tactical in the New Left reflects the consciousness of many of today's youths that long-range planning is virtually impossible."[8] If this is so, then the University of Massachusetts student power advocates seem to accept the impossibility of long-range planning somewhat more quickly than anti-student-power respondents. For example, 35 percent of the pro-student-power people, 5 percent of the anti-student-power people, and 22 percent of all students agreed with the statement, "Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself."

The responses to these questions would indicate that student power advocates are not only more critical of the institutions of society and the behavior of the people within these institutions, but also are more likely than other students to manifest distrust for the people around them and are unwilling to commit themselves to long-term goals or plans.

4. REASONS FOR ATTENDING THE UNIVERSITY

Twelve questions in the questionnaire were used to discover the reasons behind the student's presence at the University. The alternative reasons ranged from the intellectual ("intellectual stimulation," "increased knowledge and appreciation of my environment") to the practical ("job preparation," "get a degree"). There was little difference between the importance assigned each reason by the pro-student-power group as opposed to the other students with the single exception of the "increased freedom" option. When offered "increased freedom" as a reason for attending college, 79 percent of the pro-student-power people stated that this was important or very important to them, while only 32 percent of the anti-student-power group assigned any importance to this reason for pursuing higher education.

This emphasis of the pro-student-power people on "freedom" was found in other parts of the survey. In every instance where there was an issue between satisfying needs or wants and limiting access to them, the student power advocates voted one-sidedly for "freedom," whereas the anti-student-power people were much more inclined to support limitations on freedom; e.g., regarding marijuana, contraceptives, open houses, regulation of student life.

5. MEANS TO THE END

It may well be that the outcome of the student power movement of February, 1968, was in part due to the fact that, even among the

student power advocates in our survey, many may not actually favor student power as defined here.

When asked in the survey, "Suppose a regulation was being considered by the University administration that you felt was unjust or harmful. How do you think you could change it?" Seventy-two percent of the students responded, "Work within the existing institutions (student government, *Collegian*, etc.)" and only 17 percent of the sample opted for some sort of protest, chiefly nonviolent.

Working within an existing institution, such as student government, constitutes an acknowledgement of the legitimacy of existing authority. For example, a demand from the Student Senate to the Board of Trustees constitutes an acceptance of the Board in the decision-making process. Interestingly, student power advocates were almost as optimistic as their peers about the potential of working within existing institutions.

Those who were classified pro-student-power advocates seemed likely to practice what they preached. Sixty-nine percent of the group said that they had participated in an effort to change a rule compared to only 20 percent of the anti-student-power people.

6. REASONS FOR THE RADICALS' FAILURE TO CAPITALIZE ON STUDENT DISCONTENT

The initial success of the radicals on the University of Massachusetts campus in February, 1968, was probably due to a number of factors. They hit upon issues which were of real concern to the majority of the students, i.e., teaching and courses. In addition, the radical student power activists felt a bit more intensely about all issues than did the other students. There were 28 questions (in addition to the student power questions) in the survey wherein the students were offered alternatives ranging from "strong yes" to "yes" to "no" to "strong no," or ranging from "very important" to "important" to "unimportant" to "very unimportant." The pro-student-power people were more likely than other students to select one of the extremes than to settle for a simple "yes" or "no" (30 percent of the pro-student-power answers to the 28 questions were at the extremes compared to 25 percent for the middle group and 27 percent for the anti-student-power category). Therefore, one possible reason for the early success was that the intense feeling at the pro-student-power end of the spectrum was not balanced by equally intense feeling at the anti-student-power end.

The reasons for the radicals' failure to persuade large numbers of students to join them in challenging the power structure of the

University, and through the University the entire power structure of society, are several. First, the leadership of the February protest was composed of faculty and graduate students who were mainly concerned with the Vietnam War and the greater society. However, the rank-and-file student power advocate was under 21 and probably a sophomore. These divisions in age, position, and interests among the activists may have contributed to the factionalism that badly weakened them after the student-administration confrontation on February 19.

Furthermore, the administration of the University looked "good" to most students. For example, only 24 percent of the students in the sample agreed with the statement, "Most University administrators are not really interested in the problems of the average student." And, as has already been pointed out, 72 percent of the students were committed to working within the system to achieve change, and a plurality (49 percent to 43 percent with 8 percent undecided) were optimistic about the success of such efforts. Student Senate President Collins, aware of the students' friendly attitudes toward University administrators, noted that one of the plans of the radicals to which he objected was the proposal to seat the administration in the center of the Cage, with the students all around them "sort of like a Star Chamber."

The initial success of the radicals in activating students was due to a widespread desire for reform on the part of much of the student body. The failure to capitalize on the discontent stems in part from the fact that, unlike the radicals, the average student did not translate his frustration with the University into hostility toward the administration itself. Furthermore, the students possibly perceived, at the meeting at the Cage, that the radicals' anger at the system was not only more intense than their own but also extended into many areas where the average student had not felt frustration.

IV. Conclusions

The study demonstrates that there is at the University of Massachusetts a fairly broad base of students who are unhappy with the University as it presently functions and who feel that things would be better if students had a greater part in the decision-making process. These students, however, do not feel that the administration should be overthrown. Most do not believe in violent or, in most cases, even nonviolent protest as a solution to the University's problems. In all probability, many of the people identified as "pro-student-power" at

the University of Massachusetts would have opposed student power as it has been defined at Berkeley, Wisconsin, or Columbia. It is even more obvious that all of our student power advocates are not radical.

On the contrary, a large proportion of University of Massachusetts student power advocates were student government oriented, seeking change but feeling that change can come by working *with* the administration rather than by overthrowing it. The Port Huron Statement of SDS, on the other hand, dismisses student government as "a training center for those who want to spend their lives in political pretense." [9]

Student power leaders have been concerned for some time with the problem of generating a demand for radical change on campuses such as the University of Massachusetts. In a conference on Students and Society held at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions last year, student leaders discussed their feelings about American society, the role of the university and of students in changing their society, and the best ways to mobilize student support for their movement. [10]

"The mood of the conference is hammering discontent, combined with impatience for action," a Center fellow notes in a foreword. He continues, "The participants look on the United States and find it abounding in hopeless contradictions, hypocrisy, and wrongdoing. They see no benevolence in the works of the nation outside its borders, only a new imperialism that takes vicious and irrational forms in Vietnam and shows itself everywhere else only as the selfish exploiter of human beings." [11]

These student leaders, like the radical leaders at the University of Massachusetts, acknowledged that the average student did not share their discontent. "When we are talking about student power we have to see this connection between a small group of activists who are aware and a large group who are apathetic or sold out or simply don't know what's going on," said one participant. Continuing, he noted that "this apathetic majority simply cannot be dismissed. They have to be accounted for even if they are only going to be followers. There must be some motive so that they will follow, and join it." [12]

In February of 1968, radical student leaders at the University of Massachusetts initially made use of this tactic by transferring from a Vietnam protest to discussion of the issues closest to the students' needs — curriculum, courses, grades, and, later, open house. "You're trying to do two things if you're a radical working in the University," noted a leader of Berkley's Free Speech Movement at the Congress. "You're trying to build support among the students, and you're trying

to raise consciousness and link the things that students see to be wrong to more basic issues." [13]

It was precisely at this point that the University of Massachusetts student power movement broke down. Radical students failed to link discontent with courses and food to a need for more basic institutional changes. They made the attempt in the meeting at the Cage, but the majority of the students failed to react to the demands for change "right now" in the entire administrative structure of the University.

Another factor in the radicals' failure may have been the absence of a common bond of understanding between the radicals and other students. A change in tactics had brought the students to the radicals' side in the Union, but the leaders' behavior at the rally in the Cage may have reminded many students that these were people with different ideas, goals, and perceptions than their own. Statements by some of the radical leaders indicate that the students' perceptions were not misplaced. A radical leader who thinks of the students as easily misled "jocks" is not likely to enjoy the sort of confidence that he needs to get them to undertake positive action toward the goals he may suggest.

There has not been enough research into the sorts of people likely to be involved in student power movements to determine whether the University of Massachusetts variety of pro-student-power advocate is very much different from such students in other institutions. As has been noted, one such study was done by Seymour Lipset in the early 1950's.[14] It suggested that students most likely to support a faculty attack on loyalty oaths tend to be Democrats, Jewish or not religious affiliated, live on campus, come from a lower-income background, and major in the humanities or social or pure physical sciences — a profile strikingly similar to that of the University of Massachusetts student power advocates.

The most recent major study of the New Left — Kenneth Kenniston's *Young Radicals* — studied leftists, most of whom were already out of college.[15] Kenniston suggests, as noted before, that those students who are likely to become committed radicals go through a traumatic adolescence: "The preadolescent pattern of outgoing activity changed, often in a few months, to a new style of seclusiveness, a feeling of social awkwardness and moral inferiority coupled with intense intellectual concerns and, at times, extreme religiosity." [16]

"Two or three years after this upsurge of adolescent turmoil, many of the interviewees entered into a period of rebellion against their parents," Kenniston continues, "usually focused around parental

'unfairness' and 'injustice.' The particular issues at stake in these mid-adolescent rebellions centered largely around the individual's views that his parents attempted to restrict him excessively, did not allow him sufficient freedom to be 'himself,' tried to control his life, tried to plan his future, and so on." [17]

Kenniston's leftists overcame most of their adolescent problems as they resumed a preadolescent pattern of leadership and achievement in college. It may be the residuals of these adolescent crises which our survey tapped in the findings concerning student attitudes toward parents and freedom. (It must be noted, however, that Kenniston's subjects were the leaders of the Vietnam summer movement and were probably much more radical than most of the University of Massachusetts respondents.)

The present survey does not provide specific data about the future of student power at the University of Massachusetts. It would seem, however, that much depends on the kinds of leadership which the radicals develop. If there continues to be a wide gap between the radical leadership and a student-government oriented "left wing" of the student body, then the prospect is for incremental changes in University policy but little or nothing in the way of a challenge directed at the University's governing institutions.

NOTES

[1] The authors acknowledge the contribution of the members of the spring, 1968 Political Behavior seminar, who interviewed radical and moderate student leaders, professors and administrators involved in the February, 1968, student power incident at the University of Massachusetts and also helped design the study. They were Carol Childress, John Farleigh, Paul Olenick, Elizabeth Palter, Janet Peden, Guy Prim, Deborah Rossi, Paul Savage, Robert Skomro, and Benjamin Wunn. We are also grateful to the undergraduate members of the spring, 1968 Public Opinion class who administered the questionnaires to a random sample of the University student body. Finally, we wish to thank Mr. Robert Gonter of the University of Massachusetts Computer Center for his help in tabulating and analyzing the sample survey data.

[2] The origins and development of the student power movement are discussed in Paul Jacobs and Saul Landau, eds., *The New Radicals: A Report with Documents,* Vintage Books (New York: Random House, Inc., 1966).

[3] Henry May, Seymour M. Lipset and Sheldon S. Wolin, eds., "The Student Movement at Berkeley: Some Impressions," in *The Berkeley Student Revolt: Facts and Interpretations,* Anchor Books (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1965), p. 460.

[4] A. H. Raskin, Christopher Katope and Paul Zolbrod, eds. "The Berkeley Affair: Mr. Kerr vs. Mr. Savio and Co." in *Beyond Berkeley — A Scourcebook in Student Values,* (Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1966), p. 35.

[5] Kenneth Kenniston, *Young Radicals: Notes on Committed Youth,* Harvest Books (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968).

[6] Seymour Martin Lipset, "Opinion Formation in a Crisis Situation," in Lipset and Wolin, eds., *op. cit.,* pp. 464-94.

[7] Mario Savio, Mitchell Colen and Dennis Hale eds., "An End to History," in *The New Student Left — An Anthology,* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966), p. 252.

[8] Kenniston, *op. cit.,* p. 233.

[9] Port Huron Statement, in *The New Radicals,* ed. by Jacobs and Landau, p. 158.

[10] *Students and Society,* Vol. I, No. 1 of *A Center Occasional Paper* (Santa Barbara: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1967).

[11] *Ibid.,* p. 1.

[12] *Ibid.,* p. 13.

[13] *Ibid.,* p. 32.

[14] Lipset, "Opinion Formation in a Crisis Situation," pp. 464-94.

[15] Kenniston, *op. cit.*

[16] *Ibid.,* pp. 78-79.

[17] *Ibid.,* p. 84.

V. Afterword

A second survey of the student body at the University of Massachusetts was conducted in the spring of 1969. The same basic questionnaire was utilized. Several new scales dealing with black power, student leftism, citizen-duty, and citizen-efficacy were added to the student power scale.[1]

The basic attitudes of the students showed some marginal changes during the one-year interval. The students interviewed in 1969 were slightly more student power oriented than the 1968 students, and desired a major student voice in the evaluation of professors (91% from 84%); in determining course offerings (72% from 65%); in decisions affecting faculty promotion, tenure, and dismissal (34% from 27%); in faculty appointments (22% from 12%); in long-range university planning (51% from 43%); and in business decisions of the university (25% from 17%).[2]

The students' faith in their ability to obtain reforms by working through the University's existing institutions declined from 72 percent to 58 percent in 1969. It should be noted, however, that the question used in 1969 offered more "outside existing institutions" options, and this may have had some effect on the results obtained.

The students were more sympathetic than ever with the problems of American Negroes. Sixty-seven percent felt that America's black population was treated unfairly in 1968; by 1969, the figure had reached 84 percent.

Once again, rewording of the question may have influenced the result. In 1968, students were asked to agree or disagree with the statement that "Negroes were treated unfairly in the United States," but in 1969 the proposition was that "Negroes are treated fairly." Students ranked higher on a black power scale (approval of special recruitment of black students, even under lowered admissions standards; black studies program; hiring of black personnel, etc.) than they did on the student power scale and much higher than on the "new left" scale.[3] A sizeable minority (45%) of students continued to manifest disapproval of the war in Vietnam. At the same time, though, over 60 percent felt the United States to be "peaceloving" rather than "warlike." Half of the respondents (50.7%) felt the United States to be "racially bigoted" rather than "tolerant."

The respondents who ranked highest on the new left scale (based on their reactions to recruitment by Dow Chemical, campus ROTC,

demonstrations at other universities, and their definition of student power) were distinguished chiefly by their strong concentration in the humanities, their distrust of existing institutions, their approval of the legalization of marijuana, their opposition to the Vietnam war and their approval of black students' demands, particularly in regard to recruitment of more black personnel (policemen, teachers, etc.).

The 1969 survey suggested, among other things, that student power, black power, and new left advocates are indeed somewhat different groups. Student power advocates tended, among other things, to be less alienated from "proper channels" and "existing institutions" than the student leftists. They did not seem to be as strongly concentrated in the humanities or social sciences as did the student leftists. They also tended to have a larger number of females among them and were more likely to include fraternity and sorority members.

One major outcome of the 1969 sample survey was the refinement of the student power, black power, and new left scales. The responses to the questions making up each of the scales were subjected to Guttman scale analysis.[4] The results of the analyses indicated that each of the scales measured common and mutually distinct underlying attitudes.

The coefficient of reproducibility for the responses to the six student power questions was .9358.[5] In other words, in 94 percent of the cases, it was possible to predict a student's response to the six questions on the basis of his scale score. The six questions constituting the scale, in descending order of support for student power, are as follows:

1. Should students evaluate professors and courses, compile the results and make the findings available to the college community?

	1968			1969		
	N	%		N	%	
Strong yes	80	34.5	83.6%	130	44.6	91.5%
Yes	114	49.1	Pro-SP	137	46.9	Pro-SP
No	34	14.7	16.0%	22	7.5	7.8%
Strong no	3	1.3	Anti-SP	1	0.3	Anti-SP
Don't know, No answer	1	0.4		2	0.7	
TOTALS	232	100.0		292	100.0	

2. What should the role of the students be in determining course offerings?

	1968 N	1968 %		1969 N	1969 %	
Student decision	8	3.5	64.7% Pro-SP	13	4.4	72.2% Pro-SP
Joint decision (students, faculty and administration)	142	61.2		198	67.8	
Student advice	75	32.2	35.3% Anti-SP	75	25.7	27.8% Anti-SP
No student involvement	7	3.0		6	2.1	
Don't know, No answer	0	0.0		0	0.0	
TOTALS	232	100.0		292	100.0	

3. What should the role of the students be in long-range planning for the University?

	1968 N	1968 %		1969 N	1969 %	
Student decision	1	0.4	42.6% Pro-SP	1	0.3	51.7% Pro-SP
Joint decision (students, faculty, and administration)	98	42.2		150	51.4	
Student advice	102	44.0	56.5% Anti-SP	118	40.4	48.0% Anti-SP
No student involvement	29	12.5		22	7.6	
Don't know, No answer	2	0.9		1	0.3	
TOTALS	232	100.0		292	100.0	

4. What should the role of the students be in matters of faculty promotion, tenure and dismissal?

	1968			1969		
	N	%		N	%	
Student decision	1	0.4	26.7%	3	1.0	33.9%
Joint decision (students, faculty, and administration)	61	26.3	Pro-SP	96	32.9	Pro-SP
Student advice	95	41.0	73.3%	138	47.3	65.1%
No student involvement	75	32.3	Anti-SP	52	17.8	Anti-SP
Don't know, No answer	0	0.0		3	1.0	
TOTALS	232	100.0		292	100.0	

5. What should the role of the students be in the business decisions of the University (such as allocation of funds for financial aid, allocations to departments)?

	1968			1969		
	N	%		N	%	
Student decision	0	0.0	16.8%	3	1.0	24.6%
Joint decision (students, faculty and administration)	39	16.8	Pro-SP	69	23.6	Pro-SP
Student advice	70	30.2	82.3%	129	44.2	73.3%
No student involvement	121	52.1	Anti-SP	85	29.1	Anti-SP
Don't know, No answer	2	0.9		6	2.1	
TOTALS	232	100.0		292	100.0	

6. What should the role of the students be in appointment of faculty?

	1968 N	1968 %		1969 N	1969 %	
Student decision	2	0.9	12.1% Pro-SP	3	1.0	21.6% Pro-SP
Joint decision (students, faculty and administration)	26	11.2		60	20.6	
Student advice	50	21.6		127	43.5	
No student involvement	153	65.9	87.5% Anti-SP	101	34.6	78.1% Anti-SP
Don't know, No answer	1	0.2		1	0.3	
TOTALS	232	100.0		292	100.0	

The coefficient of reproducibility for the responses to the four questions making up the new left scale was .9234; i.e., in 92 percent of the cases we could predict a student's responses to the four new left questions on the basis of his scale score.[6] The four new left questions, in descending order of support for the new left, are as follows:

1. As you observe the student movements taking place around the country (Berkeley, Columbia, San Francisco State), do you feel —

	1969 N	1969 %	
An identification with the rebelling students?	18	6.1	
Sympathy with the demands but not with many of the means used?	190	65.1	71.2% Pro-NL
Disinterested and bored by all or most all of it?	32	11.0	28.1% Anti-NL
Hostility toward both the rebelling students and most of their demands?	50	17.1	
Don't know, No answer	2	0.7	
TOTALS	292	100.0	

2. Should the ROTC at the University of Massachusetts be —

	N	1969 %	
Kept off campus completely?	21	7.2	
Just another non-credit extra-curricular activity?	90	30.8	38.0% Pro-NL
Allowed to give credit for a very limited number of courses?	106	36.3	
Accorded the same status as other academic departments?	62	21.2	57.5% Anti-NL
Don't know, No answer	13	4.5	
TOTALS	292	100.0	

3. How, in your opinion, should student power be defined?

	N	1969 %	
An international movement to revolutionize society	21	7.2	
A movement to transfer university decision-making from administration to faculty and students	64	21.9	29.1% Pro-NL
A means for students to gain some influence in University decision-making	179	61.3	
A meaningless term used to promote ends unrelated to educational and other needs of students	22	7.5	68.8% Anti-NL
Don't know, No answer	6	2.1	
TOTALS	292	100.0	

4. There has been some discussion on campus about the right of Dow Chemical to recruit on campus. Which of the following positions corresponds most closely to your own feelings on the matter?

	N	1969 %	
Dow should not be allowed to recruit on campus as long as it produces napalm	18	6.1	20.5% Pro-NL
Dow should be allowed to recruit only if it engages in a public debate or discussion of its position in the war effort beforehand	42	14.4	
Dow should be ensured the right to recruit as a matter of civil liberties	167	57.2	77.1% Anti-NL
Dow should be allowed to recruit on campus and should continue to produce napalm as long as it is needed for the defense of the nation	58	19.9	
Don't know, No answer	7	2.4	
TOTALS	292	100.0	

The coefficient of reproducibility for the responses to the four questions constituting the black power scale was .9134; i.e., in 91 percent of the cases, a student's responses to the four questions could be predicted on the basis of his scale score.[7] It may be noted that the sample is badly skewed in a pro-black-power direction. However, this is probably due to the fact that the dominant ethos in New England is pro-black. The four questions, in descending order of support for black power, are as follows:

1. How do you feel about the proposal to establish a curriculum of black studies at the University?

	N	1969 %	
Strongly approve	66	22.6	81.5% Pro-BP
Approve	172	58.9	

Disapprove	41	14.1	
Strongly disapprove	10	3.4	17.5% Anti-BP
Don't know, No answer	3	1.0	
TOTALS	292	100.0	

2. The University of Massachusetts, along with many other American universities, began this year to recruit black students to the University. Traditional admission standards were waived in order to recruit black students who seemed to have the potential to succeed in college. How do you feel about this program?

	N	1969 %	
Strongly approve	98	33.6	
Approve	133	45.5	79.1% Pro-BP
Disapprove	45	15.4	
Strongly disapprove	14	4.8	20.2% Anti-BP
Don't know, No answer	2	0.7	
TOTALS	292	100.0	

3. Do you remember the day in early November when the Afro-American society marched to Whitmore and presented a list of demands to the administration? How did you feel about that march and sit-in?

	N	1969 %	
Strongly sympathetic	24	8.2	
Generally sympathetic but not in agreement with everything that was said and done	177	60.6	68.8% Pro-BP
Indifferent	29	9.9	
Opposed to the whole thing	54	18.5	28.4% Anti-BP
Don't know, No answer	8	2.8	
TOTALS	292	100.0	

4. Earlier this year, the University Afro-American organization demanded that more black policemen, doctors, teachers, and students be recruited for the University. How do you feel about this?

	1969 N	1969 %	
Strongly approve	31	10.6	
Approve	125	42.8	53.4% Pro-BP
Disapprove	101	34.6	
Strongly disapprove	24	8.2	
Don't know, No answer	11	3.8	42.8% Anti-BP
TOTALS	292	100.0	

It should be re-emphasized that each of these scales measures mutually distinct attitudes. The simple coefficient of correlation between the student power and new left scales was only .40, and between the student power and black scale was .35. The coefficient of correlation between the new left and black scales was .51. This means that only 16 percent of the distribution of respondents along the student power scale relate to or can be explained by the distribution of respondents along the new left scale. Similarly, only 12 percent of the black scale distribution relate to or can be explained by the respondents' positions on student power and 26 percent (a fairly substantial figure) by the position on new left issues. Therefore, it can be stated with some confidence that each of the scales measures a common and distinct underlying attitude.

TABLE I

The Five Variables Most Closely Related to Student Power Position by Descending Rank Order*

Step No.	Question No.	Question	Position of Pro-Student-Power People	Multiple R
1	59	*How, in your opinion, should student power be defined?* 1. An international movement to revolutionize society	Tended to select options one and two over three and four	.39

TABLE I (continued)

Step No.	Question No.	Question	Position of Pro-Student - Power People	Multiple R
		2. A movement to transfer University decision-making from administration to faculty and students 3. A means for students to gain some influence in University decision-making 4. A meaningless term used to promote ends unrelated to the educational and other needs of students		
2	57	*Do you remember the day in early November when the Afro-Am society marched to Whitmore and presented a list of demands to the administration? How did you feel about that march and sit-in?* 1. Strongly sympathetic 2. Generally sympathetic but not in agreement with everything that was said and done 3. Indifferent 4. Opposed to the whole thing	Tended to select one and two over three and four.	.45
3	1	*Sex* 1. Male 2. Female	Tended to be female	.48
4	5	*What is your class?* 1. Freshmen 2. Sophomore 3. Junior 4. Senior 5. Graduate	Tended to be freshmen and sophomores	.51
5	32	*The war in Vietnam is a natural outgrowth of American military and economic imperialism.* 1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4. Strongly disagree	Tended to select options one and two	.52

* A regression analysis provides some insights into the causative factors which make each of these attitudes distinct from one another. Regression analysis allows the singling out of the variables most closely related to student positions on student power, new left, and black power and a measure of the closeness of the relationships. Results of the regression analyses are shown in Tables I, II and III.[8]

In the foregoing table, a respondent's relative position on the student power scale is closely related to the respondent's sex, class, definition of student power, and attitude toward black demands and the Vietnam war. To be more precise, some 27 percent of the fluctuations from person to person along the student power scale can be explained by or relate to his position on these five questions, as indicated by the multiple coefficient of correlation for the five variables (R .52).

TABLE II

The Seven Variables Most Closely Related to a New Left Position by Descending Rank Order

Step No.	Question No.	Question	Position of New Left on Question	Multiple R
1	55	*Earlier this year, the University's Afro-American organization demanded that more black policemen, doctors, teachers, and students be recruited for the University. How do you feel about this?* 1. Strongly approve 2. Approve 3. Disapprove 4. Strongly disapprove	Tended to select options one and two	.44
2	37	*Which, if any, of the following methods do you think can best be used to deal with the central problems of American society today?* 1. Work within the existing institutions (Democratic or Republican parties, run for office, write letter to Congressmen) 2. Individual efforts 3. Work outside the existing institutions, through third party movements or non-violent protest 4. Work outside the existing institutions, through violent protest 5. Revolution is the only answer 6. None of these — it's hopeless	Tended to select options four, five, and six.	.53
3	60	*Do you believe that the use, possession and sale of marijuana should be legalized?*	Tended to select options one and two.	.59

TABLE II (continued)

Step No.	Question No.	Question	Position of New Left on Question	Multiple R
		1. Strongly yes 2. Yes 3. No		
4	4	*What is your major area?* 1. Humanities 2. Social sciences 3. Biological sciences 4. Physical sciences 5. Education 6. Business 7. Nursing 8. Engineering 9. Agriculture	Tended to select options one and two	.62
5	48	*What should the role of the students be in determining course offerings?* 1. Student decision 2. Joint decision of the students, faculty, and administration 3. Student advisory participation 4. No student involvement	Tended to select options one and two	.65
6	32	*The war in Vietnam is a natural outgrowth of American military and economic imperialism.* 1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4. Strongly disagree	Tended to select options one and two	.67
7	20	*Fraternity or sorority* 1. Active member 2. Inactive member 3. Non-member	Tended to select option three	.69

As the multiple R of .69 in the foregoing table reveals, almost 50 percent of the variation from person to person in their new left sympathies can be explained by or relate to attitudes toward 1) the more radical demands of black power advocates, 2) existing political institutions as means of solving problems, 3) legalization of marijuana, 4) major, 5) student power demands, 6) Vietnam war, and 7) membership or non-membership in a fraternity or sorority.

It is interesting to note the similarities and the differences in the factors related to student power and new left advocacy. Both groups are concerned with black issues and the Vietnam war. However, sex and class year are closely related to student power advocacy and are unrelated to a new left position. On the other hand, major, marijuana advocacy, and despair with existing political institutions were important factors leading to a new left position, but do not appear to be important contributing causes behind student power advocacy.

TABLE III

The Four Variables Most Closely Related to Black Power Positions by Descending Rank Order

Step No.	Question No.	Question	Position of Black Power Advocates on Question	Multiple R
1	30	*Most American Negroes are treated fairly.* 1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4. Strongly disagree	Tended to select options three and four	.50
2	58	*As you observe the student movement taking place around the country (Berkeley, Columbia, San Francisco State), do you feel —* 1. An identification with the rebelling students? 2. Sympathy with the demands but not with many of the means used? 3. Disinterested and bored by all or most of it? 4. Hostility toward both the rebelling students and most of their demands?	Tended to select options one or two	.58
3	59	*How, in your opinion, should student power be defined?* 1. An international movement to revolutionize society 2. A movement to transfer decision-making from administration to faculty and students 3. A means for students to gain some influence in University decision-making	Tended to select options one or two	.61

TABLE III (continued)

Step No.	Question No.	Question	Position of Black Power Advocates on Question	Multiple R
		4. A meaningless term used to promote ends unrelated to the educational and other needs of students		
4	42	*Since you have been at the University, have you ever participated in a student effort to change a policy or regulation?* *(If yes) How? Have you —* 1. Signed a petition, worn a button? 2. Written a letter, tried to convince friends your position was right? 3. Gone to meetings? 4. Worked on committees or other groups? 5. Picke[illegible]ed or passed out leaflets?	Tended to select options four or five	.64

It would seem, based on the evidence in the last table, that the black power enthusiasts differ in motivational terms from both the student power and new left advocates, although the evidence continues clear that there is a fairly close connection between new left positions and black power advocacy. A student's position on the scale is closely related to 1) his belief that Negroes are treated fairly or unfairly in the United States, 2) sympathy with or antipathy toward student movements and student power, and 3) whether or not he has involved himself in protest activities of one kind or another.

Unlike student power or new left positions on the University of Massachusetts campus, advocacy of black power is not closely related to age, sex, class, major, or non-membership in conventional groups.

In summary, then, the 1969 survey revealed a shift of student opinion toward a greater support of student power and black issues. There is no comparative data for new left positions. The scales used to measure student power, new left, and black power attitudes of University of Massachusetts students proved adequate as a means of measuring these attitudes, as indicated by the results of Guttman scale analysis. Further, the results of regression analysis indicated that these three attitudes are mutually distinct and flow from somewhat different motivational and group membership stimuli.

Perhaps the most important finding is that nine of the top 16 variables related to student power, new left, and black power attitudes were campus-centered, e.g., major, class, student role in course offerings, etc. Therefore, it seems that possible solutions to these problems may also be found on the campuses.

NOTES

[1]The authors acknowledge the contribution of the members of the spring, 1969 Political Behavior seminar, who helped design the 1969 study. They were: Kathleen Connelly, Paul Dommel, Zillah Eisenstein, Arthur Glaude, Curtis Penoyer, and Frank Shepherd. We are also grateful to the members of the spring, 1969 Public Opinion class who administered the questionnaire to the student body.

[2]The percentage figures were obtained by summing the percentage supporting options one and two for each student power question.

[3]University of Massachusetts students were skewed to the political right, skewed in favor of black power, and were distributed normally on the student power issue.

[4]See Lee F. Anderson, Meredith W. Watts, Jr., and Allen R. Wilcox, *Legislative Roll Call Analysis* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1966), pp 89-119, for a good exposition of Guttman scale analysis.

[5]In computing the coefficient of reproducibility options one and two were collapsed and treated as "yea" votes and options three and four were collapsed and treated as "nay" votes.

[6]In computing the coefficient, options one and two were collapsed and treated as "yea" votes and options three and four were treated as "nay" votes.

[7]In computing the coefficient options one and two were collapsed and treated as "yea" votes and three and four were treated as "nay" votes.

[8]The procedure in the regression analysis for Tables I, II and III is as follows: In step number one, a partial correlation was obtained for each of 80 variables (the 80 questions in addition to the scale questions) which gave a numerical statement of the closeness of the relationship between each variable and the positions of respondents on the scale independent of the other 79 variables. The variable with the largest partial correlation is the variable shown in step number one. Then, in steps numbered two, three, four, etc., the same procedure was followed for 79 variables, 78 variables, 77 variables, etc. Then as each variable is added a multiple correlation is obtained, which shows the relationship of the variable in combination with all the preceding variables with the positions of students on the scale.

APPENDIX A

Sample Survey Results

Responses to Opinion and Attitude Questions

A. THE UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT

Following are the responses to a variety of questions dealing with life at the University of Massachusetts by the 232 students who were interviewed.[1] In every case, except where noted, the percentages by responses are of the 232 students who answered the questions. Some of the more interesting findings are that "job preparation" is by far the most important reason selected for attending college, followed by "self-knowledge," "intellectual stimulation," "to get a degree," and "acquisition of specialized knowledge." It would appear, then, that students attend the University out of many motives, including practical and intellectual, but that the practical one of "job preparation" is of primary importance.

The student respondents were also queried about the importance to them of a number of possible problems at the University. Greatest concern was expressed with the problem of "poor teachers" followed by "rigidity of course requirements" and "inability to register for desired courses." Relatively little concern was expressed by the students about "loneliness in a big university" and the degree to which their lives are regulated. In addition, the administrators of the University were favorably perceived by most of the students as "concerned with the problems of the average student." Finally, very few students volunteered any criticisms of the University environment when offered the opportunity to do so.

---

[1] In all interviews, the chances were 95 out of 100 that the opinions of the entire student body of the University were within plus and minus 7 percentage points of the given figure.

OPINION AND ATTITUDE QUESTIONS

I have a list of reasons that some people give for attending college. As I read each of these reasons, will you tell me if it is very important, important, or very unimportant to you.

	Responses in Percentages			
	Very Important	Important	Unimportant	Very Unimportant
1. Job preparation	60	34	5	1
2. Get a degree	36	52	11	1
3. Intellectual stimulation	41	49	7	3
4. Find a husband or wife	2	13	55	30
5. Social life	7	61	27	5
6. Parental wishes	5	42	39	14
7. Social pressure	4	34	47	15
8. Acquisition of specialized knowledge	32	60	8	0
9. Increased freedom	16	44	31	9
10. Income potential	28	56	14	2
11. Increased knowledge and appreciation of my environment	31	59	9	1
12. Self-knowledge	43	49	6	2

I have a list of problems that some students say they have faced at the University. As I read each of the problems, will you tell me it it has been very important, unimportant, or very unimportant to you as a student.

	Responses in Percentages				
	Very Important	Important	Unimportant	Very Unimportant	NA
13. Poor teachers	28	40	27	3	2
14. Inability to register for desired courses	19	36	34	9	2
15. Student life over-regulated	7	26	48	16	3
16. Rigidity of course requirements	31	37	23	3	6
17. Loneliness in a big university	5	18	49	25	3

18. Are there any other problems that I have not mentioned that are important to you as a student?

No other problem	73
One problem	16
Two problems	5
Three problems	4
Four or more problems	2

19. Tell me if you agree or disagree with the following statement: Most university administrators are not really interested in the problems of the average student.

Agree	24
Disagree	74
Don't know, no answer	2

B. STUDENT POWER

An effort was made in this survey to measure student attitudes toward every possible dimension of student power both in terms of extent (ranging from regulation of student housing to the business decisions of the University) and degree (ranging from "student decision" to "advisory role" to "no student involvement"). There was also an effort to measure the commitment of students to "activism" in order to obtain their ends and their commitment to channeling their activism within the existing University institutions.

The findings were 1) that about half of the student body was "activist" in the sense that they said they had participated in an effort to change a policy or regulation and over half said they would participate in such an effort if they felt that a rule was "unjust." In addition, the students were optimistic about success if they should make such an attempt and were overwhelmingly committed to working within existing institutions; 2) in terms of extent and degree of student power orientation, most students felt that they should have a major voice in determining house rules and in establishing the University course offerings; they also felt that students should evaluate professors and courses; they expressed a preference for a student

advisory role in long-range planning for the University and in faculty promotion, tenure and dismissal; most expressed a preference for "no student involvement" in appointment of faculty and business decisions of the University.

STUDENT POWER QUESTIONS

20. Suppose a regulation were being considered by the university administration that you felt was unjust or harmful. How do you think you could change it?

Work within the existing institutions (student government, *Collegian*, etc.)	72%
Individual effort	6
Nonviolent protest	16
Violent protest	1
None of these — it's hopeless	4
Don't know, no answer	1

21. If such a case arose, how likely is it that you would actually do something about it?

Very likely	10%
Likely	54
Unlikely	27
Very unlikely	6
Don't know, no answer	3

22. If you made an effort to change this regulation, how likely is it that you would succeed?

Very likely	5%
Likely	44
Unlikely	35
Very unlikely	8
Don't know, no answer	8

23. Since you have been at the University have you ever participated in a student effort to change a policy or regulation?

Yes	49%
No	51

24. Do you think each house on campus should be free to set its own visiting rules?

Strongly yes	30%
Yes	55
No	12
Strongly no	2
Don't know, no answer	1

25. What do you think house visiting rules on campus should be?

No limitation	22%
Weekday hours	10
Weekend hours	58
Present system	9
No visiting	0
Don't know, no answer	1

26. How effective do you think the student senate will be in persuading the university to change the visiting rules?

Very effective	6%
Effective	53
Not very effective	30
Very ineffective	5
Don't know, no answer	6

27. Should students evaluate professors and courses, compile the results and make the findings available to the college community?

Strongly yes	34%
Yes	49
No	15
Strong no	1
Don't know, no answer	1

28. How much voice should students have in determining course offerings? Should these decisions be made:

Entirely by the students	3%
Through joint decision of the students, faculty, and administration	61
With student advisory participation	32

No student involvement	3
Don't know, no answer	1

29. What should the role of the student be in matters of faculty promotion, tenure, and dismissal?

Student decision	1%
Joint decision of students, faculty and administration	26
Student advisory participation	41
No student involvement	32

30. What should the role of the student be in the appointment of faculty?

Student decision	1%
Joint decision of students, faculty, and administration	11
Student advisory participation	21
No student involvement	66
Don't know, no answer	1

31. What should the role of the student be in long-range planning for the University?

Student decision	1%
Joint decision of students, faculty, and administration	42
Student advisory participation	44
No student involvement	12
Don't know, no answer	1

32. What should the role of the student be in the business decisions of the university (such as allocation of funds for financial aid, allocations to departments, etc.)?

Student decision	0%
Joint decision of students, faculty, and administration	17
No student involvement	52
Student advisory participation	30
Don't know, no answer	1

C. SEX AND MARIJUANA

Most of the students surveyed opposed legalizing the use and sale of marijuana, although the majority were favorably inclined toward increased sexual freedom.

SEX AND MARIJUANA QUESTIONS	Responses in Percentages				
	Strong Yes	Yes	No	Strong No	Don't know No answer
33. Should the university health services make contraceptives available to students?	12	46	31	8	3
34. Do you believe that the use, possession and sale of marijuana should be legalized?	10	29	34	24	3
35. Do you think there is greater sexual freedom today than in the past?		86	11		3
36. If yes, on balance, do you approve of this increased sexual freedom?	13	56	15	5	11

D. FAITH IN PEOPLE

Most of the students took a relatively "sunny view" of their fellow man and the society in which they live. However, a full 40 percent of those surveyed felt that "most people don't really care what happens to the next fellow."

FAITH IN PEOPLE QUESTIONS	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know No Answer
37. These days a person doesn't really know who he can count on.	31	68	1
38. Most people don't really care care what happens to the next fellow.	40	58	2
39. It's hardly fair to bring children into the world, the way things look for the future.	6	93	1
40. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself	20	79	1

E. THE FAMILY

The overwhelming majority of the University of Massachusetts students felt that their parents have done a good job of raising them. Substantial majorities of the students thought that their parents understood them either well or pretty well, and that their parents were "about right" in the way they supervised them.

FAMILY QUESTIONS	
41. Are your parents divorced or separated?	
Yes	5
No	92
Don't know, no answer	2
Deceased	1
42. How often do you leave campus and go home to see your family?	
Frequently	28
Only on regular school holidays	50
Seldom as possible	12
Live at home	10
43. How well do you think your parents understand you?	
Very well	29
Pretty well	56
Not so well	12
Not at all	3

F. THE ENVIRONMENT OUTSIDE THE UNIVERSITY

Most students felt that Negroes are treated unfairly in the United States, but they were also opposed to "busing" Negro students. The students were about evenly divided on the issue of halting the bombing of North Vietnam. However, they were optimistic by wide margins about the possibilities of finding solutions to the problems of race and the Vietnam War.

When offered choices between favorable and unfavorable perceptions of the United States in six broad areas of American life and behavior, the majority of the students selected "peaceloving," "moral," and "cultured," as their choices in three of the six areas; in the other three areas the majority chose "racially bigoted," "hypocritical," and "class conscious." Thus, perceptions of American life and culture seemed to be mixed between favorable and unfavorable perceptions.

Most of the students felt that the national government is the institution which can most effectively deal with the central problems of American society. However, only 21 percent selected "working within either the Democratic or Republican party" as the best method of obtaining political change. Most of the students selected "individual effort" as the preferable means of obtaining change.

THE ENVIRONMENT OUTSIDE THE UNIVERSITY QUESTIONS

Some students are concerned with international and national policy questions these days. I have a list of statements on current issues. Will you tell me if you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with each one?

	Responses in Percentages				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	NA
45. Most U.S. Negroes are treated unfairly	15	52	30	2	1
46. The problems of race and civil rights in this country are just about unsolvable	3	15	64	17	1
47. The bombing of North Vietnam should be halted in order to encourage a negotiated settlement of the war.	15	36	32	13	4
48. There does not seem to be any way for the U. S. to get out of the war in Vietnam	4	23	52	19	2
49. Negro students should be bused from racially imbalanced schools to predominantly white schools	4	33	43	17	3

Which of the following characteristics would you say predominate in American society? If you are undecided, pick the alternative which you think comes closest to being accurate.

50. Racially bigoted	55%
Tolerant	42
Don't know, no answer	3

51.	Warlike and aggressive	37%
	Peaceloving	57
	Don't know, no answer	6
52.	Immoral	24%
	Moral	67
	Don't know, no answer	9
53.	Hypocritical	61%
	Sincere	34
	Don't know, no answer	5
54.	Vulgar	36%
	Cultured	56
	Don't know, no answer	8
55.	Class conscious	80%
	Equalitarian	19
	Don't know, no answer	1

56. Which, if any, of the following institutions could deal most effectively with the central problems of American society today?

National government	55%
State and local government	27
Church	0
None of these	16
Don't know, no answer	2

57. Which, if any, of the following methods could deal most effectively with the central problems of American society today?

Participation in the Democratic or Republican party	21%
Individual effort	51
Third party movement	5
Nonviolent protest	12
Violent protest	1
None of these — it's hopeless	4
Don't know, no answer	6

APPENDIX B
Cross-Tabulations of Sample Survey Results

A. CAMPUS ORGANIZATIONS

Turning first to campus organizations, we find that active fraternity members as well as active members of athletic groups, service clubs, hobby clubs, and professional or academic groups include very few strong student power advocates. The inactive members of these groups include somewhat more student power advocates, and those students who do not belong to these groups include among their members a fairly substantial proportion of students who are strongly committed to student power. The following table provides the exact figures.

TABLE I
Campus Groups by Proportions of Student Power Advocates

	% of Pro-Student Power	% of Other Students	Number of Students
1. Fraternity or Sorority*			
Active member	11	89	57
Inactive member	19	81	16
Not a member	25	75	159
2. Athletic Groups			
Active member	12	88	41
Inactive member	16	84	25
Not a member	23	77	166
3. Service Clubs			
Active member	09	91	22
Inactive member	14	86	14
Not a member	23	77	196
4. Hobby Clubs*			
Active member	15	85	20
Inactive member	17	83	18
Not a member	22	78	194
5. Professional or Academic Groups			
Active member	09	91	47
Inactive member	23	77	26
Not a member	24	76	159

*"Don't know" are classified as "not a member."

B. CHURCH MEMBERSHIP AND ATTENDANCE

When we move off the campus, we find once again that the students who do not belong to conventional groups are more likely to be stronger student power advocates than those who do belong to these groups. This proposition is demonstrated clearly by the small percentages of Protestant and Catholic students who are student power advocates as opposed to the proportionately larger numbers of Jewish, Unitarian and other, and "no religious faith" students who adhere to strong student power positions. As Table II shows, the less conventional the church membership and the less frequent the church attendance, the more likely the student is to advocate student power.

TABLE II
(Off-campus)

Religious Groups and Church Attendance by Proportions of Student Power Advocates

	% of Pro-Student Power	% of Other Students	Number of Students
1. Religious Preference			
Protestant	14	86	62
Catholic	19	81	94
Jewish	22	78	31
Unitarian and other	30	70	10
None or no religious faith	31	69	35
2. Church Attendance*			
Attend frequently	17	83	91
Attend seldom	20	80	101
Never attend	34	66	35

*There were five students who refused to answer the church attendance question, one of whom was a student power advocate.

C. THE FAMILY

The relationship between an absence of close family ties and student power advocacy is even more pronounced than in the previously cited cases of relationships between student power orientation and non-membership in church and campus groups. As Table III reveals, the student who goes home as seldom as possible, feels that his parents do not understand him, and believes that his parents were too permissive in supervising him, is the most likely to be a strong student power advocate.

TABLE III
Family Membership Status by Proportions
of Student Power Advocates

	% of Pro-Student Power	% of other Students	Number of Students
1. How often do you leave campus and go home to see your family?			
Live at home	09	91	23
Frequently	19	81	66
School holidays	19	81	115
As seldom as possible	39	61	28
2. How well do you think your parents understand you?*			
Very well	17	83	66
Pretty well	18	82	109
Not so well	33	67	27
Not at all	57	43	09
3. Would you say that in supervising you, your parents were**			
About right	19	81	195
Too strict	27	73	22
Too permissive	36	64	14

*Two "don't know" responses.
**One "don't know" response.

D. GROUPS WITH LARGE PERCENTAGES OF STUDENT POWER ADVOCATES

Table IV contains a list of all groupings of students for which there is data which contain a markedly larger percentage of student power advocates than that of the entire student body. Specifically, the Table lists all groupings in which 26 percent or more of the students are in the strongly "pro-student-power" category. The Table, in addition to reaffirming the observations already made concerning the relationship between nonmembership in conventional groups and student power orientation, also reveals that the student power group consists of a coalition of discontented groups. It would appear from the Table that the students most likely to espouse student power on the campus are females who are in their sophomore year, receive poor grades, do not profess or practice a religious faith, get along poorly with their parents, identify with the Democratic party, and have fathers who are also Democrats and are employed in blue collar jobs.

TABLE IV
All Groupings of Students Containing 26 Percent or More Student Power Advocates in Descending Order

Groups	% of Pro-Student Power	% of Other Students	Number of Students
Total Student Body	21	79	232
Parents understand "not at all"	57*	43	07
Go home "as seldom as possible"	39	61	28
Parents "too permissive"	36	64	14
Never attend church	34	66	35
Parents understand "not so well"	33	67	27
Democratic party preference	32	68	25
No "religious faith membership"	31	69	35
Father's occupation "blue collar"	31	69	45
Unitarian and faiths other than Protestant Catholic, Jewish	30	70	10
Female	29	71	100
Does not "believe in God"	28	72	32
Below a "C" average	28	72	36
Mother's political preference "Independent"	28	72	36
Parents "too strict"	27	73	22
Father's political preference Democrat	26	74	60
Sophomore	26	74	70

E. OTHER GROUPS

There were three categories of campus organizations wherein the members were as likely to be student power advocates as the non-members. These groups, as shown by Table V, are the Student Government members, Honor Society members, and members of Church-related groups. It should be noted that in no case were the members significantly more likely to be student power oriented than non-members. The explanation for the relatively greater student power orientation of Student Government members is easy to divine, i.e., student government involves student power by definition. The only surprise is that so small a proportion of these students are in the strong pro-student-power category. No easy explanation, however, comes to mind to explain the relatively pronounced pro-student-power bias of campus-church related group members, especially in light of the findings earlier reported of the distaste for student power manifested by students who attend church frequently. One possible explanation is the "advanced" position taken by some campus chaplains on virtually all social questions, ranging from civil rights to Vietnam and including student power. The statistics in Table V may reflect the impact of their personalities on the students. In the case of Honor Society members, the explanation for the relatively pronounced pro-student-power bias of these students may, once again, reside in the leadership of this group.

TABLE V
Campus Groups in Which Members are as Likely to be Student Power Oriented as Nonmembers

	% of Pro-Student Power	% of Other Students	Number of Students
1. Student Government			
Active member	23	77	26
Inactive member	14	86	14
Not a member	21	79	192
2. Campus-Church Related			
Active member	24	76	29
Inactive member	12	88	41
Not a member	22	78	162
3. Honor Society			
Active member	20	80	15
Inactive member	23	77	18
Not a member	21	79	199

F. THE ANTI-STUDENT-POWER POSITION

There were 37 students out of the 232 in the sample who received student power scores of from 22 through 26, which means that they were opposed to even a student advisory role in most aspects of the government of the University. In Table VI, these 37 students are examined in terms of the groupings of students from which they were most likely to come.[1] As the Table shows, the graduate students are, by far, the most anti-student-power group on the campus followed by those students who live at home, identify with the Republican party, are older students (age 21 and over), and whose father is a proprietor of a small business and is a fourth generation or more American. Other groupings which contribute disproportionate members of anti-student-power people are those whose father is in the "other white collar" occupation category, males, active fraternity members, those with "too permissive parents" (this is the only category to appear at both extremes), engineering majors, and those whose mother's political preference is Republican.

[1]Table VI includes all groupings of students in which 20 percent or more of the members are anti-student-power, excluding the "don't know" and "inactive member" categories. It is interesting to note in this connection that anti-student-power people were much more likely to answer "don't know" to the "Do you believe in God?" question than the pro-student-power or the middle-of-the-road students. There were 14 students out of the 232 in the sample who replied "don't know" and 8 out of the 14 were in the anti-student-power category.

TABLE VI

All Groupings of Students Containing 20 Percent or More Anti-Student-Power Advocates in Descending Order

Groups	% of Anti-Student Power	% of Other Students	Number of Students
Total Student Body	16	84	37
Graduate Students	43	57	23
Live at home	35	65	23
Republican party preference	33	67	30
Father's occupation, small business	24	76	38
Fourth generation or more American	24	76	63
Age 21 and over	24	76	100
Father's occupation "other white collar"	23	77	34
Male	21	79	132
Active fraternity or sorority member	21	79	57
Parents "too permissive"	21	79	14
Engineering major	20	80	15
Mother's political preference Republican	20	80	55

G. PROFILES OF STUDENT POWER AND ANTI-STUDENT-POWER GROUPS

In the preceding pages we attempted to "get at" causative factors behind the pro-student-power position by examining the various social, economic, political, and other demographic factors that are related to a student power and an anti-student-power position.

We now turn to Table VII, which contains data designed to provide a picture of the dominant characteristics of the students at the two extremes of the student power continuum. Reference to the Table reveals that the pro-student-power people tend, in the main, to be 1) female (60 percent); 2) young (60 percent under 21); 3) freshmen, sophomores, or juniors (73 percent); 4) almost evenly divided between those who prefer a conventional religious group membership (58 percent Catholic and Protestant) and those who do not; 5) overwhelmingly first, second, or third generation Americans (77 percent); 6) almost all Democrats or Independents in political preference (85 percent); and 8) go home infrequently (69 percent).

By way of contrast, Table VII also contains data on the anti-student-power group. The anti-student power group is 1) one-sidedly male (76 percent); 2) consists largely of older students (65 percent age 21 or over); 3) includes a relatively large number of seniors and graduate students (49 percent); 4) also includes a sizeable proportion (41 percent) of fourth generation or more students; 5) is one-sidedly Independent or Republican (70 percent); 6) includes a high proportion (41 percent) of fraternity or sorority members, and 7) most (54 percent) either live at home or visit home frequently.

TABLE VII

Background Data by Student Power and Anti-Student-Power Groups

	Strong Pro-Student Power		Strong Anti-Student Power		Total Sample	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Sex						
Male	19	40	28	76	132	57
Female	29	60	9	24	100	43
Total	48	100	37	100	232	100
2. Age						
21 and over	19	40	24	65	100	43
Under 21	29	60	13	35	132	57
Total	48	100	37	100	232	100

	Strong Pro-Student Power		Strong Anti-Student Power		Total Sample	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
3. Class						
Freshmen, Sophomores, and Juniors	35	73	18	49	154	66
Seniors & Graduate Students	12	25	18	49	74	32
Others	1	2	1	2	4	2
Total	48	100	37	100	232	100
4. Religion						
Catholic & Protestant	27	56	28	76	156	67
All other	21	44	09	24	76	33
Total	47	100	37	100	232	100
5. Generation American						
Fourth or more	11	23	15	41	63	27
All other	37	77	22	59	169	73
Total	48	100	37	100	232	100
6. Political Preference						
Republican	5	10	12	32	49	21
Democratic	19	40	7	19	73	31
Independent	22	46	14	38	97	42
Don't know	2	4	4	11	13	6
Total	48	100	37	100	232	100
7. Fraternity or Sorority						
Active & in-active member	9	19	15	41	73	32
All other	39	81	22	59	159	68
Total	48	100	37	100	232	100
8. Family membership						
Live at home	2	4	8	22	23	10
Visit home frequently	13	27	12	32	66	28
Visit on school holi-days	22	46	14	38	115	50
Visit as sel-dom as possible	11	23	3	8	28	12
Total	48	100	37	100	232	100

H. POSITIONS ON ISSUES

We now turn to all issue questions wherein there was a substantial difference of opinion between student power advocates as opposed to those with anti-student-power preferences.

FAITH IN PEOPLE

There were five questions which were designed to obtain some notion of the students' attitudes toward their fellowman, the leadership, and values of the society. In every case, the student power advocates were more negative in their views of man and society than the other categories of students. Table VIII contains the responses of student power and anti-student-power respondents to the two questions on which there was the greatest difference of opinion. As the Table shows, the pro-student-power advocates were much more likely than the anti-student-power people or "all students" to "agree" that "these days a person doesn't really know who he can count on," and also to "agree" that "nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself." It should be noted that, even so, less than a majority of the student power students agreed with these statements.

It is interesting to note that the anti-student-power people are quite serious (only 5 percent agreed with the "live-for-today" question) and are substantially more optimistic about their fellowman than the other students (only 22 percent agreed that "these days a person doesn't really know who he can count on" compared to 44 percent of the pro-student-power advocates).

TABLE VIII
Faith in People

1. These days a person doesn't really know who he can count on.

	Pro-Student-Power		Anti-Student-Power		All Students	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Agree	21	44	8	22	71	31
Disagree	27	56	28	75	158	68
Don't know, no answer	—	00	1	03	3	01
Total	48	100	37	100	232	100
2. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.						
Agree	17	35	2	05	47	20
Disagree	31	65	34	92	182	79
Don't know, no answer	—	00	1	03	3	01
Total	48	100	37	100	232	100

I. CAMPUS ISSUES

The responses to the questions dealing with reasons for attending college revealed only one major difference between the pro-student-power and other students. (See Table IX). The pro-student-power group by a 71 percent majority regarded "Increased Freedom" as an important or very important reason for attending college. On the other hand, only 32 percent of the anti-student-power group and 59 percent of all students regarded this reason as important.

TABLE IX
Reasons for Attending College

	Pro-Student Power		Anti-Student Power		All Students	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Increased Freedom						
Important	38	79	12	32	138	59
Unimportant	10	21	25	68	94	41
Total	48	100	37	100	232	100

J. SEX AND MARIJUANA

According to Table X, the pro-student-power group is one-sidedly (75 percent) in favor of the University Health Services making contraceptives available to students. A majority (57 percent) of the anti-student-power people are opposed to this proposal.

It is also true that a narrow majority of the pro-student-power people (52 percent) support legalizing the sale, possession, and use of marijuana, whereas the anti-student-power group is overwhelmingly opposed (68 percent) to this proposal as is the majority (58 percent) of all students.

TABLE X
Sex and Marijuana

1. Should the University health services make contraceptives available to students?

	Pro-Student Power		Anti-Student Power		All Students	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	36	75	15	41	135	58
No	11	23	21	57	91	39
Don't know	1	02	1	02	6	03
Total	48	100	37	100	232	100

2. Do you believe that the use, possession, and sale of marijuana should be legalized?

Yes	25	52	11	30	81	39
No	22	46	25	68	133	58
Don't know	1	02	1	02	8	03
Total	48	100	37	100	232	100

K. ACTIVISM ON CAMPUS

The pro-student-power category includes a very high proportion of activists, whereas the anti-student-power people are much less likely to protest a ruling or regulation. As Table XI reveals, 71 percent of the pro-student-power people say that they have participated in an effort to change a policy or regulation, compared to only 30 percent of the anti-student-power group and 49 percent of all students.

TABLE XI

Activism on Campus

1. Since you have been at the University have you ever participated in a student effort to change a policy or regulation?

	Pro-Student Power		Anti-Student Power		All Students	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	34	71	11	30	113	49
No	14	29	26	70	119	51
Total	48	100	37	100	232	100

L. VIETNAM AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Table XII indicates that pro-student-power advocates are overwhelmingly in favor of stopping the bombing of North Vietnam (73 percent) and the anti-student-power people are almost equally one-sidedly opposed (60 percent). The student body as a whole is evenly divided on the Vietnam issue.

With respect to civil rights, the majority (54 percent) of the pro-student-power group is in favor of busing Negro students from racially imbalanced schools to predominantly white schools, whereas the anti-student-power group is overwhelmingly opposed (73 percent) to this proposal.

TABLE XII
Vietnam and Civil Rights

	Pro-Student-Power No.	%	Anti-Student-Power No.	%	All Students No.	%
1. The bombing of North Vietnam should be halted in order to encourage a negotiated settlement of the war.						
Agree	35	73	12	32	120	52
Disagree	12	25	22	60	103	44
Don't know	1	02	3	08	9	04
Total	48	100	37	100	232	100
2. Negro students should be bussed from racially imbalanced schools to predominantly white schools.						
Agree	26	54	8	22	88	38
Disagree	22	46	27	73	138	59
Don't know	—	—	2	05	6	03
Total	48	100	37	100	232	100

M. PERCEPTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

Table XIII shows that the pro-student-power group is more likely to perceive the citizenry of the United States as "Hypocritical" and "Warlike and Aggressive" than the anti-student-power group or the student body as a whole.

TABLE XIII
Perceptions of United States

	Pro-Student-Power No.	%	Anti-Student-Power No.	%	All Students No.	%
1. Choice between "warlike" and aggressive" and peaceloving.						
Warlike and aggressive	24	50	12	32	87	37
Peaceloving	23	48	21	57	132	57
Don't know	1	02	4	11	13	06
Total	48	100	37	100	232	100
2. Choice between "hypocritical" and "sincere."						
Hypocritical	37	77	19	51	142	61
Sincere	10	21	15	41	79	34
Don't know	1	02	3	08	11	05
Total	48	100	37	100	232	100

PREVIOUS PUBLICATIONS IN THIS SERIES

Bolner, James with Shanley, Robert A. *Civil Rights in the Political Process: An Analysis of the Massachusetts Racial Imbalance Law of 1965.* (1967), 90p.
This case study discusses the origins of the racial imbalance controversy in Massachusetts and more particularly in Boston and analyzes the politics of the complex process leading to the adoption of the Racial Imbalance Law.

Booth, David A. (ed.). *Urbanizing the Bureau Philosophy.* (1968), 43p.
This collection of papers and comments, delivered originally at the 1968 conference of the American Society for Public Administration, discusses the role of university bureaus of government research in dealing with new problems of urban life.

Coulter, Philip and Gordon, Glen. *Voting Behavior in Massachusetts: Explorations in Political Ecology.* (1967), 62p.
This study examines the relationship between patterns of partisan behavior and the social structure of towns and cities in Massachusetts, inquiring into both the nature of this relationship and whether it varies for different elective offices.

Gere, Edwin A. Jr., *Rivers and Regionalism in New England.* (1968), 76p.
This study examines the principle and practice of regional interstate cooperation with regard to water resources in New England and explores its significance for a strengthened Federal system.

Goldman, Sheldon. *Roll Call Behavior in the Massachusetts House of Representatives: A Test of Selected Hypotheses.* (1968), 83p.
This monograph analyzes the backgrounds of members of the Massachusetts House; certain characteristics of their constituencies; and the extent and nature of party voting in the House, each of which in turn is related to four major kinds of issues which came before the House in 1965 and 1966.

Goodwin, George Jr., (compiler). *A Selected Bibliography on Massachusetts Government and Politics.* (1968), 34p.
This bibliography emphasizes politics in Massachusetts, although some administrative and general governmental entries are included.

Gordon, Glen. *The Legislative Process and Divided Government.* (1966), 112p.

This case study examines the effect of "divided" government upon the passage of the Federal Housing Act of 1959, tracing the inter-relationships of a Democratic Congress and a Republican President through the various stages of the legislative process.

Howards, Irving and Gere, Edwin A., Jr. *Some Notes on Regionalism with Particular Reference to New England.* (1960), 16p.

These essays explore briefly two major arguments concerning regionalism: (1) the so-called psychological regionalism, which has its origins largely in political boundaries, and (2) functional regionalism, which derives from the presence of a great number of regional factors in cooperative regional enterprises. (Supply exhausted)

Mayhew, David R. *Two-Party Competition in the New England States.* (1967), 20p.

This study examines the reasons for New England's move from a predominantly Republican to a predominantly Democratic section, while voters nationally have been abandoning regional allegiances and moving toward two-party competition.

Shanley, Robert A. *The Problem of Simplifying the Massachusetts Constitution.* (1966), 40p.

This essay discusses the complexity of the present state constitution, notes past efforts to simplify it, identifies areas in need of simplification, and suggests methods by which to proceed toward a simpler document. (Supply exhausted)